

for the payment of a debt than one. The king and the people are bound to God for each other. *Ergo*, if the king forsake God, and the people strive not to win him from the evil of his ways, but connive at his sin, the people is guilty of his sin, and *vice versa*. Resistance is thus involved in the contract. If the king may resist the people should the people forsake God, the people may equally resist the king if the king forsake God. To make a contract with the people as one of the parties, and yet doom the people to bondage to the king's will, is both unscriptural and illogical. There can be no contract with a slave. And God would not punish the people for the sins of the prince, if their negligence, connivance, or stupidity were not punishable according to contract. The people is the guardian of religion as well as the prince, and if the prince takes arms against the people for their adherence to their trust, the people may take arms against the prince.

But is the people not a beast with many heads and liable to many disorders ? Were it not insane to give the direction of affairs to an unruly and unbridled multitude ? True, but by the people our author understands the constituted representatives of the people, the magistrates, the States-General, whom it has substituted for itself to restrain encroachments on its sovereignty. For the people which establishes the king is superior to the king, and the principal persons of the kingdom may associate together as its representatives in resistance to tyranny. Nay, in the case in which the king persuades the majority to become idolaters, the minority led by the chief men—princes and magistrates—may resist the majority. Such a minority are not rebels, for there is a contract, not only between God and the king and the people but between the king and the people. By this second contract the people promised obedience only as far as the king ruled them justly, and if the king breaks faith with them he is the rebel. Where there is no justice there is no commonwealth, and resistance to what is unlawful is no rebellion. It does not, however, pertain to individuals to resist, for the covenant is not with individuals but with the people, and only the people, or those who represent it, are bound to observe its stipulations.